

1 William P. Ramey, III (appearance *pro hac vice*)  
2 wramey@rameyfirm.com  
3 RAMEY LLP  
4 5020 Montrose Blvd., Suite 800  
5 Houston, Texas 77006  
6 Telephone: +1.713.426.3923  
7 Facsimile: +1.832.689.9175

8 Susan S.Q. Kalra, Bar No. 167940  
9 skalra@rameyfirm.com  
10 Ramey LLP  
11 5020 Montrose Blvd., Suite 800  
12 Houston, Texas 77006  
13 (800) 993-7499  
14 (832) 900-4941 (facsimile)

15 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
16 LAURI VALJAKKA

17 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
18 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
19 **OAKLAND DIVISION**

20 LAURI VALJAKKA,

21 Plaintiff,

22 v.

23 NETFLIX, INC.,

24 Defendant.

25 Case No. 4:22-cv-01490-JST

26 **REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR**  
27 **LEAVE TO SUPPLEMENT SUMMARY**  
28 **JUDGMENT RECORD BASED ON**  
29 **ARGUMENTS RAISED AT THE**  
30 **HEARING UNDER RULE 56 (D) AND (E)**

31 Judge: Hon. Jon S. Tigar  
32 Date: February 15, 2024  
33 Time: 2:00 p.m.

34 Crtrm: 6 – 2nd Floor

1           **I. INTRODUCTION**

2           Lauri Valjakka (“Valjakka”) files this reply in support of his request to supplement the  
 3 summary judgment record, showing the Court Defendant Netflix’s response does not change that  
 4 the issue was newly raised at oral argument and therefore this supplement is appropriate.  
 5

6           **II. NETFLIX’S RESPONSE DOES NOT ESTABLISH A SUPPLEMENT ON**  
 7           **COMITY IS NOT APPROPRIATE**

8           Netflix’s response<sup>1</sup> merely attempts to say the issue of comity was mentioned in a case that  
 9 referred to another case.<sup>2</sup> However, Netflix did not raise the issue raise the *Akazawa* case in its  
 10 Motion, only its reply.<sup>3</sup> Likewise, both parties cited the case not for a principal of comity but  
 11 rather that foreign law can be used to decide ownership of a patent. Neither party briefed comity  
 12 or its application in this case. Valjakka moved to supplement the record under Rule 59(e) in the  
 13 interests of fairness and substantial justice to address this narrow issue.

14           **III. FURTHER APPEALS OF FINNISH OWNERSHIP**

15           Netflix’s response also fails to refute the fact that the Court in the summary judgment  
 16 hearing said that Valjakka should address the issue of ownership in Finnish Courts. Well, Valjakka  
 17 is doing that through a filing in the Finnish Market Court. A delay of a few months to obtain a final  
 18 ruling from the Finnish Market Court would serve the interests of justice. Netflix will not be  
 19 prejudiced as it requested a delay in the trial date and the Court has only recently issued a new  
 20 dispositive motion period with a new trial date.<sup>4</sup>

22           **IV. CONCLUSION**

23           Valjakka respectfully requests that the Court grant it leave to file this brief supplement based  
 24 on the new case discussed at the hearing.  
 25

---

27           <sup>1</sup> Doc. No. 245.  
 28           <sup>2</sup> *Id.* at 2-3.  
 29           <sup>3</sup> *Akazawa v. Link New Tech. Int’l, Inc.*, 520 F.3d 1354, 1357 (Fed. Cir. 2008).  
 30           <sup>4</sup> Doc. No. 247.

1  
2 Respectfully submitted,  
3  
**Ramey LLP**

4                           */s/ William P. Ramey, III*  
5 William P. Ramey, III  
6 Texas State Bar No. 24027643  
7 5020 Montrose Blvd., Suite 800  
8 Houston, Texas 77006  
9 (713) 426-3923 (telephone)  
10 (832) 900-4941 (fax)  
11 wramey@rameyfirm.com

12                           *Attorneys for LAURI VALJAKKA*

13                           **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

14 Pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, I hereby certify that all counsel of record  
15 who have appeared in this case are being served on this day of December 11, 2023, with a copy of  
16 the foregoing via e-mail.

17                           */s/William P. Ramey, III*  
18 William P. Ramey, III

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28